DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 123 750 EA 008 304

AUTHOR Wiles, David K.; Wiles, Marilyn M.
TITLE Cross-Referencing the Professorship, Male Induction and Female Sexuality Models: An Inherent "Inappropriateness" Referrent.
PUB DATE [76]
NOTE 14p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Rank (Professional); Affirmative Action; *College Faculty; Expectation; Feminism; Higher Education; Organizational Theories; *Role Conflict; *Role Models; *Role Perception; Role Theory; Sex Discrimination; Sex Role; Sex Stereotypes; *Women Professors

ABSTRACT

Appropriateness for any particular organization role involves a calculation of identifiable expectations. The induction phase of new members identifies a set of role expectations. Unobtrusive but obvious "other" expectations play a large part in determining the appropriateness of both role and induction in organizations. This paper discusses the unconventional expectations associated with the label, "feminine," as it affects role referrents of professorship within higher education. It is hypothesized that the present lack of consistent expectations for female faculty has created role confusion that cannot be alleviated by some manipulation of traditional bureaucratic, male, or induction role expectations. Specifically, cross-referencing the conventional classifications of university professional, male induction, and female sexuality, reveals two types of role inappropriateness for the female professor: (1) that in direct conflict with the traditional male induction model, and/or (2) a professor role that has no "correct" sexuality referrent. (Author/MLF)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED123750

CROSS-REFERENCING THE PROFESSORSHIP, MALE INDUCTION AND FEMALE SEXUALITY MODELS: AN INHERENT "INAPPROPRIATENESS" REFERRENT

David K. Wiles
Marilyn M. Wiles

Conventional views of institutions would lead one to conclude that "appropriateness" for any particular organization role involves a calculation of identifiable expectations. Such expectations, normally included in role theory of organization[1], include formal rules, regulations, standard operating procedures, informal routines and "demographic" personalistic factors (like experience level, age, type of skill training). On the other hand, the concept of organizational socialization[2] seems to have a clear cut focus upon such aspects as the induction phase of new members to identify a set of role expectations (e.g. entry, transition, maintainance activities).

Yet, with the guidance of socialization and role theory, there seems a growing awareness of unobtrusive but obvious "other" expectations which play a large part in determining the "appropriateness" of both role and induction in organizations.

Among the labels identified with these "other" expectations are ambivalent, institutional racism and feminism[3]. Beyond the popularized recognition of the existance and effect of these inconsistent and unclear organizational expectations (e.g. personnel practices such as "minorities" hiring), there is a lack of specification as to what these factors mean for role. As the data suggests, (e.g. Affirmative Action, collective negotiation) ambivalents, racists, feminists and other labels for unconventional role expectations will continue to be a part of a complete organizational classification. Why then does there seem a lack of systematic effort to deal with specification of this type of expectations? Does the emotional trappings of such labelling

EA 008 304

strip these expectations of credibility or significance? We assume another possibility; that lack of systematic study and specification may indicate wrong conceptual and methodological lens to approach the topic. While a different approach may ultimately lead to the same conclusion of an inability to specify "unobtrustive" expectation, it seems important to suggest other starting points for an exploration to begin.

The purpose of this paper is to discuss the unconventional expectations associated with the label, "feminine" as it affects role referrents of professorship within higher education. It is hypothesized that the present lack of consistent expectations for female faculty has created role confusion which cannot be alleviated by some simple manipulation of traditional bureaucratic, male or induction role expectations. Specifically, cross-referencing the conventional classifications of university professional,"male" induction and female sexuality reveals two types of role "inappropriateness" for the female professor; (a) that which is, by definition, in direct conflict with the traditional male induction model and/or (b) a professor role that has no "correct" sexuality referrent.

I. The Emerging Female

With the possible exception of the "bicentennial", few labels bandied about as freely as the "women's movement" (touching every hot topic from abortions to new prototypes of potential presidential assassination). Like other unconventional role expectations, it has become popular and "legitimate" to talk glibly of feminism as if there were universal concrete referrents. For example, the United Nations declared 1975 International Woman's Year,

the various states continue to debate the Equal Rights Amendment and universities have witnessed a proliferation of Woman's Studies Programs[4]. However, each of these examples have shown an illusion of commonality when attempts to clarify specific, agreed upon indicators of understanding are made. In an effort to avoid the divisive political ramifications of such illusion, proponents of the women's movement often establish a general format of one argumentative premise and two remedial actions. The premise is that women have been unduly discriminated against in their efforts to rise to human and professional roles that socially have been assigned a higher status. The two most popular steps toward remediation are (a) increase the number of females in formally held organizational (read male) positions[5] and (b) decrease sex role stereotyping in the socialization of the young[6]. Within this broad context the research and literature attempting to provide a clearer picture of feminism has taken several distinguishable characteristics. First, there has been a proliferation of "macro" cultural analyses[7] focussed upon the historical, anthropological role of women. For example, M. Z. Rosaldo and L. Lamphere[8] address the issue of female role confusion from a societal perspective and cite the fundamental reasons for its occurrence. They argue that female status is based on participation in the economic production process. Women's contribution to subsistence is crucial to determining her status within a particular society. Two issues are identified: (1) Are women presently contributing to the economic subsistence of the society? If so, in what types of recognized positions? (2) Within the smaller subculture of the university and/or school district, are women perceived and recognized as full contributors to the subsistence of the organization or system? In answering the issues the following type of conclusion is drawn. In societies where domestic and political spheres are separated, women

are subordinate. Where they are integrated, equal status is shared by men and women. The American culture explicitly values the separation of these two spheres. The low number of females in politics is one of the most glaring indicators. This invariably leads to the nature of the female role after entry into a male dominated position in organizations.

Studies of this type are interesting and, supported by impressive statistics, validate the existance and scope of the problem. However, the very nature of their conceptual and methodological focus does not allow operational definition of femininism as an independent variable in conjunction with other organizational expectations. Documentation of <u>effect</u> (whether economic, political, social or organizational) does not help specify <u>how</u> "femininism" is identified and operates in organizational settings.

A second body of "woman's" literature and research describes the entry and exit conditions of organizations. This type of effort supports directly the general argumentative premise and rationales for remediation. The usual format emphasizes existing or potential ratios and quotas.[9]

The third type of literature (and even some research) is the emotional prescriptions for "femininism." Most efforts of this type cite several concrete examples of discrimination and then, based upon the data, provide the reader with the abstract prescription of "assert thyself".[10]

We are not suggesting that the three literature and research thrusts discussed above are without merit. On the contrary, sensitizing an apathetic audience is often the mandatory, first step of "unfreezing" before detailed exploration can be attempted. However, none of the three thrusts focus upon "feminism" as an internal, organizational expectation. The first two thrusts look at broad "causes" or organizational effects. The third type of effort uses internal examples in establishing licence to make broad pronouncements. We

feel all three thrusts fail to provide a means to the understanding of the "feminine" dilemma within the constraints of an organizational setting. The following discussion attempts to provide another perspective to the study of women's role; the cross-referencing of organizational induction processes and emerging role expectations for the female professor in higher education. As will become apparent, focus upon internal conversion processes of an organization provides very different messages for the meaning of female role "appropriateness" than literature and research thrusts which concentrate upon the environmental relation to the organization.[11]

II. The Professorship, "Male" Induction and Female Sexuality

Focus upon actual induction of a new member to an organization raises questions of "fit" between the existing precedents of "appropriateness" and the inductee. The professorship has both general university expectations and other role commonalities which can account for acceptance or non-acceptance beyond sexual distinction. The conventional specification of professor normally demands commitment to teaching, research, publication, university service (read committee work) and field or community activities. There is no set rationale of how a particular person may balance these expectations but these are the areas which focus promotion, salary and tenure consideration. Consequently, these provide one base to judge "appropriateness." A related base are the non-sexual referrents which distinguish a new member to their colleagues. These may include age, extent and type of experience and attitude (for example, "cosmopolitan" versus "local"[12]). In the case of these two sets of professorship expectations, both the new female and new male inductee face the same problems of "fit."

There is, however, a second type of induction which is decidedly sexual; one which we call "male." Male induction as a process of judging "appropriateness" evolves from both the role relation of the larger society scoped into the

cultural context of the university[13] and the very numbers of present male role incumbents. For example, the typical view of a professional woman in education is that of teacher, and a female member of a College of Education staff is usually associated with teacher education, (especially elementary) or home economics[14]. In "non-female" areas, such as educational administration, research or educational psychology, a new female inductee may well represent the first "token" affirmative action compliance effort.

Male induction has one overt characteristic in relation to "appropriateness"; the specialness of male role arrangements. This aspect of induction provides entry for males to help mediate conflicts of "fit", access to special areas (e.g. men's room) off limits to women and access to special information and methods of communication (e.g. "off color" jokes). These special aspects provide forums and means to convey critical socialization expectations to the new inductee (e.g. where lobbying for key votes occurs before or during faculty meeting breaks). This aspect of organizational induction allows personalized congruencies to grow and cover or mediate role conflicts among males which result from professorship expectations. Thus, a young, inexperienced, highly specialized cosmopolitan professor may still find inductions commonalities with older, experienced, generalist, localized professors <u>if the incumbents are male</u>. Over time, the common male referrent will bury the technical inconsistencies and the male professor now "fits" the appropriateness criteria of the precedent expectations.

The physical presence of females in organizational roles raises another sexual connotation for induction. However, the sexual referrent for "female" is a dominated status[15]. Further, when placed in an organizational role which, by professorship expectations, may well indicate peer or superordinate relations with colleagues, the conflict of status is obvious. The personal uncertainties of any new inductee in how to "act equal" on a "professional" level <u>forces a sexual response</u>. However, there is no smoothing male induction process to

provide a vehicle for achieving congruency when the female is uncertain of the "professorship" expectations. Thus, the female often attempts one of three response patterns; ape maleness (e.g. one of the boys), be decidedly "anti-male" (e.g. Good Ship Lollipop or swinger) or waffle between the two extremes and see a psychiatrist (also be known as "teaser").

In terms of the specialiness aspect of male induction it is important to emphasize that entry is not allowed to the female professor. Rather than the process providing a bridge to commonality grounds, it heightens difference. In the woman's case, the youth, inexperience, cosmopolitan nature of the professor may extend sexual difference because there is no female induction mechanism to provide a normative "override" blanket. In fact, just the opposite occurs. Femaleness now becomes the rationalization for the "non-fit" of the other professorship characteristics[16].

III Cross-referencing Sexual and Professional Expectations

The contention that there is no counterpart for male induction and that female sexuality has no "appropriateness" standards for the professor role can be further demonstrated. A cross referencing of terms associated with various sexual models[17] reveals strong meanings for what is "consistent" for both the nonprofessional and professional lives of women. While the actual descriptors are debatable (the reader can obviously add to each cell or argue with a particular placement) the schematic illustration represents confusion based on different forms of sexual models which a female professor might try.

Female Models: Expectations for Professionals
in Leadership Roles in Education

	Traditional Female Roles: Sexually Consistent	Traditional Female Roles: Sexually Non-Consistent (Male Characteristic)	Emerging Non-Traditional Roles: Non-Sexual
Non-Professional Characteristics	domestic child oriented wife mother sister girl friend submissive "attractive" feminine	career oriented childless aggressive dominant outgoing	career oriented home oriented child oriented equal responsibility wife, mother, sister girl friend, fellow worker upward mobile "attractive"
Professional Characteristics	unattractive "Old Maid" mannish Early Childhood Edn. Elementary Edn. limited expertise non-political non-threatening secretary teacher	competitive upward mobile aggressive politically astute administration Ph.D, Ed. D. university professor superintendent principal	competitive competent

Even a rather cursory examination of the matrix reveals inconsistencies in model formation and terminology in all sexual cells, both in professional and non-professional characteristics. The obvious contradictions, level of abstraction and the inadequate number of descriptors in the professional/emerging section, all demonstrate the inability to crossreference and achieve consistency.

As previously discussed, the large number of women entering into educational leadership roles is a recent phenomenon. Upon entry, they lack any predetermined or legitimized model of "appropriateness" upon which they can base either sexual or professional behavior. The only models as described in the

matrix reflect traditional characteristics which are limited or misleading in their nature. If the female was characterized in a new professor position as (1) "attractive", (2) young in relationship to others, (3) feminine, (4) aggressive, and (5) competent, it would be impossible to assign her an appropriate female model. A sex role incongruency occurs and provides one explanation for the high degree of anxiety and frustration among female professionals in educational leadership.[18]

IV Suggestions for Female Professors

Of course, the professorship only provides a vehicle in a particular type of organization for a much larger issue context. The focus upon the internal conversion processes of the organization suggests continued sexuality confusion and induction conflict for females, no matter how affirmative action alters the gatekeeping aspects of male/female faculty ratio. Bluntly, there is an inherent female sexuality "inappropriateness" based upon the specialness of male induction to mediate professorship incongruencies. Female attempts to get special male entry cards or to hope sexuality confusion will abate seem fruitless. We suggest that the best efforts to achieve true "peer" standing would be to not try to fight fire with fire. At first blush, it seems logical that if sexuality is the core problem then it should be tackled head on (particularly among professions where you can appeal to "reason" and "logic"). However, this article tries to demonstrate that the core of the confusion is so deep seated that female "inappropriateness" is an inherent (even subconscious) "given" in induction.

We feel a non-sexual "peer" acceptance may be possible by concentrated effort to shift focus to another point of newcomer difference with precedent. While sexual confusion would remain, the female professor could (1) conserve

the energy that would have gone into attempts to redress sexual discrimination and (2) construct a more manageable, fair arena to try and achieve acceptance. For example, if a female professor with high technical skills (eg. research methodology) could find ways that those skills could be valuable to nontechnical male colleagues, sexuality can be downplayed as a basis for inappropriateness. Further, the conscious building of new reward payoff expectations to achieve an acceptance of colleagues on non-sexual grounds (eg. joint consu ing efforts) may begin new induction processes. We prefer to believe male induction was a method created to smooth professorship expectations before the time of its use as a tool of sexual discrimination. We further believe there are many male professors that use and tacitly support the special processes of male induction who are also very embarrassed by its function and are looking for alternatives.[19] In many organizational contexts, the issue of "appropriateness" is decided by sizing up a situation, going to war and winning or losing. Perhaps the message from this perspective of "femininity" in organizations is the necessity of creating a new battlefield.

NOTES

1. Robert Owens, Organizational Behavior in Schools, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1970, pp. 69-72.

2. David O'Shea, Sociology of the School and Schooling, Washington, D.C.: NIE, 1974.

3. These labels represent two types of "other" classification; abstract characterizations of mass popular movements and specific terms associated with an author. In this example, ambivalent is distinguished from indifferent and upward mobile by Robert Presthus. See Men at the Top, New York: McGraw Hill, 1964.

4. Myra Strober "Woman Economists: Career Aspirations, Education and Training", American Economic Review, Vol. 65, May 1975, pp. 92-96.

5. Alice Amsden and Colette Mosher, "Job Search and Affirmative Action", American Economic Review, Vol. 65, May 1975, pp. 83-91.

6. See, for example, Lynne Iglitzin, "Making of the Apolitical Women: Femininity and Stereotyping in Girls" in Jane Jaquette (ed) Women in Politics, New York: John Wiley, 1974, pp. 25-36.

7. As opposed to the "micro" behavioral-interactive context. Compare the review essay on political science by Kay Boals with that of Stack, Carol, et. al. on anthropology in Signs, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1975, pp. 147-174, for examples of assumed methodological difference.

8. Rosaldo, M. Z., and L. Lamphere. Women, Culture and Society. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1974.

9. For example, Hallon, Charles, and Gary Gemmill. "A Comparison of Female and Male Professors on Participation in Decision Making, Job Related Tension, Job Involvement, and Job Satisfaction, Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. 12, No. 1 (Winter 1976) pp. 80-93.

10. See, for example, V. Gornick and B. Moran (ed) Women in Sexist Society New York: Basic Books, 1971.

11. For an excellent discussion of conceptual and methodological limitations see Jay Starling "The Use of Systems Constructs in Simplifying Organized Social Complexity" in Todd LaPorte (ed) Organized Social Complexity Princeton University Press: Princeton, 1975, pp. 151-174.

12. Terms first coined by A. W. Gouldner. For a cogent discussion by Gouldner on the effects of assumptions about human beings and society see The Coming Crisis in Western Sociology, New York: Basic Books, 1970.

13. A. Theodore (ed) The Professional Women, Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing, 1970.

14. H. S. Astin, et. al. Women: A Bibliography on their Education and Careers, Washington, D.C.: Behavioral Publications, 1971.

15. See J. Huber (ed) Changing Women in a Changing Society, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.

16. Ibid.; Theodore, op cit.; also C. F. Epstein, Woman's Place, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971.

17. For extensive discussion on the sexual referrent of language see B. Thorne and N. Henley (ed) Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance, Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1975 or M. R. Key, Male/Female Language, Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1975.

18. Hallon and Gemmill, op cit. For a larger perspective of the context for personal and organizational transformation see Manfred Halpern, The Dialectics of Transformation in Politics, Personality and History, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976.

19. It is suggested that overt sexist socialization may result from more covert, abstract assumptions about consistency, purposefulness and rationality in logical thinking. For an example of this argument see C. Ehrlich, "The Male Sociologist's Burden: The Place of Women in Marriage and Family Texts," Journal of Marriage and the Family, Vol. 30, August, 1971, pp. 421-430.

OTHER REFERENCES

Anderson, Scarvia (ed) Sex Differences and Discrimination in Education Worthington: Charles Jones Publishing, 1972.

Astin, Helen The Woman Doctorate in America, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969.

Burstyn, J. "Women and Education: A Survey of Recent Historical Research", Educational Leadership, Vol. 31, November, 1973, pp. 173-77.

Epstein, Cynthia "Bringing Women In: Rewards, Punishment and the Structure of Achievement" Annals of New York Academy of Sciences, March, 1973.

Estler, Suzanne "Women as Leaders in Public Education" Signs, Vol. 1, No. 2, 1975, pp. 363-386.

Graham, Patricia "Status Transition of Women Students, Faculty and Administrators" in Rossi, A. and Calderwood, A. (ed) Academic Women on the Move, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1973.

Holmstrom, Engin and Holmstrom, Robert "The Plight of the Women Doctoral Student" American Educational Research Journal, Vol. 11, No. 1, Winter, 1974, pp. 1-17.

Leland, Carole "Women-Men-Work: Women's Career Aspirations as Affected by the Male Environment", Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University, 1965.

Lyon, C. D. and Saario, T. "Women in Public Education: Sexual Discrimination in Promotions" Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 55, October, 1973, pp. 120-123.

Mattes, L. and Watkins, J. "Women in Administration in Schools of Education" Intellect, Vol. 102, November, 1973, pp. 32-33.

Ridley, Jeanne, "Demographic Change and the Roles and Status of Women" Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 375, Jan. 1968, pp. 15-25.

Stodt, Martha "Autonomy and Complexity in Women Teachers in Leadership Positions" Doctoral Dissertation, Columbia University, 1972.

Taylor, Suzanne, "Educational Leadership: A Male Domain" Phi Delta Kappan Vol. 55, October, 1973, pp. 124-128.